

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicants originally submitted Claims 1-26 in the application. In response to an election requirement, the Applicants provisionally selected Claims 1-7 without traverse. Accordingly, Claims 8-26 are presently withdrawn.

In the present response, the Applicants have amended Claims 1-3. No other claims have been amended, canceled or added. Accordingly, Claims 1-7 are currently pending in the application.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-2 and 6-7 under 35 U.S.C. §102

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-2 and 6-7 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,441,637 to Neeb. The Applicants respectfully disagree since Neeb does not teach a centralized connector module including a dielectric body having interconnected terminal sets corresponding to components connectable thereacross wherein the centralized connector module is incapable of controlling the components as recited in amended independent Claim 1.

Neeb is directed to power continuity testing of devices performed in parallel. (*See* column 1, lines 8-10.) Neeb discloses a testing apparatus 10 to perform power continuity testing for a plurality of devices under test (DUTs). The testing apparatus 10 includes part of a parallel testing system having a power supply 16 such that multiple DUTs can be tested simultaneously. (*See* column 2, lines 17-34 and Figure 1.) The testing apparatus 10 also includes a digital voltmeter (DVM) 20 and a test control apparatus 22. (*See* column 3, lines 21-37 and Figure 1.)

The Examiner asserts the test control apparatus 22 is the centralized connector module as presently claimed. (*See* Examiner's Action, page 2.) The test control apparatus 22, however, is capable of controlling components connected thereacross. For example, the test control apparatus 22

controls the power supply 16 connected thereto. (*See* column 3, lines 38-68.) Additionally, the test control apparatus 22 can be a computer or other machine using software programs to control testing of components. (*See* column 3, lines 28-33 and column 4, lines 34-44.) Thus, Neeb does not teach a centralized connector module including a dielectric body having interconnected terminal sets corresponding to components connectable thereacross wherein the centralized connector module is incapable of controlling the components as recited in amended independent Claim 1.

Therefore, Neeb does not disclose each and every element of amended independent Claim 1 and as such, is not an anticipating reference of Claim 1 and Claims dependent thereon. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the §102 rejection with respect to Claims 1-2 and 6-7 and allow issuance thereof.

II. Rejection of Claims 3-4 under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected Claims 3-4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Neeb in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,075,448 to Verkhowskly. As discussed above, Neeb does not teach each element of amended independent Claim 1. Additionally, Neeb does not suggest each element of amended independent Claim 1 since Neeb discloses a test control apparatus 22 that controls components connected thereto. Thus, Neeb does not teach or suggest a centralized connector module including a dielectric body having interconnected terminal sets corresponding to components connectable thereacross wherein the centralized connector module is incapable of controlling the components as recited in amended independent Claim 1.

Verkhowskly is directed to electrical circuit testing where rugged testing equipment is required. (*See* column 1, lines 6-8.) Verkhowskly has not been cited to cure the above deficiency

of Neeb but to teach the subject matter of dependent Claims 3-4. (*See* Examiner's Action, page 3.) As such, the cited combination of Verhowskly and Neeb does not teach or suggest each element of independent Claim 1 and Claims dependent thereon. Thus, the cited combination does not provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness of Claims 3-4 that depend on Claim 1. Claims 3-4, therefore, are not unpatentable in view of the cited combination of Neeb and Verhowskly. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the §103(a) rejection and allow issuance of Claims 3-4.

III. Rejection of Claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected Claims 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Neeb in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,323,652 to Collier, *et al.* As discussed above, Neeb does not teach or suggest each element of amended independent Claim 1. Collier is directed to electrical testing device for power extension cords and electrical power tools. (*See* column 1, lines 12-14.) Collier has not been cited to cure the above deficiency of Neeb but to teach the subject matter of dependent Claim 5. (*See* Examiner's Action, page 4.) As such, the cited combination of Collier and Neeb does not teach or suggest each element of independent Claim 1 and Claims dependent thereon. Thus, the cited combination does not provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness of Claim 5 that depends on Claim 1. Claim 5, therefore, is not unpatentable in view of the cited combination of Neeb and Collier. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the §103(a) rejection of Claim 5 and allow issuance thereof.

IV. Comment on Cited References

The Applicants reserve further review of the references cited but not relied upon if relied upon in the future.


V. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, the Applicants now see all of the Claims currently pending in this application to be in condition for allowance and therefore earnestly solicit a Notice of Allowance for Claims 1-7.

The Applicants request the Examiner to telephone the undersigned attorney of record at (972) 480-8800 if such would further or expedite the prosecution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

HITT GAINES, PC



J. Joel Justiss
Registration No. 48,981

Dated: _____

8/15/05

P.O. Box 832570
Richardson, Texas 75083
(972) 480-8800